

**Health Professions Council
Education & Training Panel – 5 July 2007**

PROGRAMME APPROVAL

Executive Summary and Recommendations

Introduction

The visitors have confirmed that the conditions relating to the following programmes approval have been met. The visitors are now satisfied that the programmes meet the standards of education & training and wish to recommend approval. The attached visitors' reports have been updated to reflect that the conditions have been met.

| Education provider | Programme name | Delivery mode |
|---|--|------------------------|
| Anglia Ruskin University | Non Medical Prescribing for Nurses and Allied Health Professionals | Part-time |
| Anglia Ruskin University | BSc (Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic Imaging) | Part-time |
| Anglia Ruskin University | BSc (Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) | Part-time |
| Anglia Ruskin University | Dip HE Operating Department Practice | Full-time |
| Canterbury Christ Church University | Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals | Part-time |
| Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd) | Dip HE Operating Department Practice | Full-time |
| Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd) | BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy | Full-time |
| Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd) | Pg Dip Occupational Therapy | Full Time Accelerated |
| Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd) | BSc (Hons) Radiotherapy & Oncology | Full-time |
| Cardiff University (Prifysgol Caerdydd) | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography & Imaging | Full-time |
| University of Central England in Birmingham | Fd Sc Health and Social Care (Paramedic Science) | Full-time |
| University of Essex | BSc (Hons) Biomedical Sciences (Integrated) | Full-time |
| Glasgow Caledonian University | Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9) Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 10) Non-Medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11) | Part-time |
| Leeds Metropolitan University | Non-Medical Prescribing | Flexible |
| University of Northumbria at Newcastle | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Sciences | Full-time Part-time |

| | | |
|------------------------|--------------------------------------|-----------------------|
| University of Paisley | Non-Medical Prescribing | Flexible Part-time |
| University of Plymouth | Dip HE Operating Department Practice | Full-time |
| University of Stirling | Non-Medical Prescribing | Part-time |
| University of Teesside | Dip HE Operating Department Practice | Full-time |

Decision

The panel is asked to approve the above named programmes, in line with the visitors' recommendations that the programmes now meet the standards of education and training.

Background information

None

Resource implications

None

Financial implications

None

Appendices

Visitors reports (16)

Date of paper

25 June 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | Anglia Ruskin University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Non-Medical Prescribing for Nurses and Allied Health Professionals |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | Part-time |
| Date of Visit | 12 April 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Gordon Burrow (Podiatrist) Mark Woolcock (Paramedic) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Mandy Hargood Tracey Samuel-Smith (Observing) |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Jenny Gilbert (Chair) Sara Elliott (Secretary) David Bird (NMC) Jonathan Knowles (ARU) Dennis Wheeler (ARU) Sandra Burley (University of Hull) |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|---|
| New programme | |
| Major change to existing programme | X |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-----|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-----|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | X | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|-----------------------------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 40 x 2 Cohorts approx |
|--|-----------------------------|

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2.3 compliance with any health requirements; and

Condition: The admissions procedure must include a clear criteria for students in regard to the health requirements needed for admission to the programme.

Reason: Currently the criteria is not clear for health checks prior to admission to the programme. It should be redrafted to reflect the need for students to declare a clear health record.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Condition: There must evidence of Allied Health Professional (AHP) staff involvement in the management committee for the module.

Reason: Currently the documentation provided to the visitors does not indicate that there is any AHP involvement with the programme, however during the discussions it became apparent that there was AHP input to the programme and this must therefore be clearly indicated in the Programme documentation.

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Condition: The HPC must receive clear student cohort numbers for the programme.

Reason: It was noted during the discussions at the visit that the numbers for each student cohort taking the programme was not clear. HPC requires a clear student cohort number to ensure that there are sufficient resources in place to support the students whilst on the programme.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31 May 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31 May 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATION

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The WEBCt and the Library resources should be inclusive for AHPs and of contemporary currency.

Reason: During the resources tour and IT presentation it became apparent that the WEBCt and the books and periodicals had limited relevance for AHPs. If student AHP numbers are to increase there should be adequate resources to support this increase.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Mark Woolcock

Gordon Pollard

Date: 16 April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | Anglia Ruskin University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | BSc(Hons) Radiography (Therapeutic) incorporating FdSc Radiotherapy and Oncology Practice BSc(Hons) Radiography (Diagnostic) incorporating DipHE Medical Imaging Practice |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | PT |
| Date of Visit | 20 th -21 st February 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Miss Linda Mutema Mrs Julie O'Boyle |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Miss Daljit Mahoon |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Dr Trevor Bolton – Associate Dean – Ashcroft Business School Caroline Curren – Institute of Health & Social Care Susan Hughes – Principle Lecturer, Ashcroft International Business School David Flinton – Senior Lecturer – City University Martin West – Deputy Director – Department of Radiography –Cardiff University Professor Angela Duxbury – Discipline Lead – Sheffield Hallam University Bev Snaith – Consultant Radiographer – Emergency, Pinderfields General Hospital Libby Martin – Faculty Quality Assurance Officer Sharon Croxon – Academic regulations Officer |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|----------------------|-------------------------------------|

| | |
|--|--------------------------|
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 17 |
|---|-----------|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme Admissions

2.3 ensure that the education provider has an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

SET 5 Practice Placement Standards

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition:

The equal opportunity and anti-discriminatory policy of the university and the individual practice placement needs to be clearly articulated within the student handbook.

Reason:

The documentation did not clearly articulate the equal opportunity and anti-discriminatory policy for both the university and practice placements. This needs to be included within the documentation to ensure that students and practice placement providers are informed.

Condition 2

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition:

The course team are advised to ensure that all of the HPC Standards of Proficiency are included within the mapping document. The module descriptors and all learning outcomes for the programme should clearly demonstrate how all of the Standards of Proficiency are addressed.

Reason:

The documentation lacked evidence which ensured that this standard is met. It was unclear on how students after completing the programme can meet all the Standard of Proficiency.

Condition 3

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Condition:

The documentation should clearly articulate the requirements regarding student progression from one stage to the next.

Reason:

Students need to be provided with a clearer indication of their progression through the programme. The documentation did not clearly articulate when and how (including any conditions which must be met prior to progression) students progress through each stage of the programme.

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation

To continue to ensure there is an adequate number of staff in relation to the student intake

Reason:

There should be an assurance that there is enough staff to deliver the programme effectively, without compromising HPC standards of proficiency, and that there is an adequate balance between staff and students.

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Recommendation

The programme team to adopt the protocol to obtain consent from students participating as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching.

Reason:

At present consent is being given by students; however it would be beneficial for the programme team to adopt a more structured protocol when obtaining consent.

SET 4 Curriculum Standards

4.3 Integration of theory and practice must be central to the curriculum to enable safe and effective practice.

Recommendation

The course team to consider how they support those students whose practical experience is in advance of their academic underpinning knowledge.

Reason:

After meeting the students it became apparent that many have already gained experience of carrying out specific tasks within the trusts where they are employed, prior to gaining academic underpinning knowledge.

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation

To explore provision of opportunity for inter-professional learning which could be incorporated within the programme

Reason

For the benefit of the programme and students it is encouraged for more thought to be given on incorporating more opportunities for inter-professional learning within the programme.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation

To revise the audit documentation for placements to reflect modern radiographic practice.

Reason

Evidence of audit documentation for placements was provided. It is advised that the programme team should continue their audits and for the benefit of the programme, should ensure that the nature of the audits are up to date with modern radiographic practice

Commendations

- 1) It was apparent that the programme team are experienced in delivering distance learning programmes.**
- 2) The demonstration of the e-learning environment was impressive and supports our observations of the team.**
- 3) We received positive feedback from the students regarding the level of support they received from the university.**

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 16th April 2007

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Julie O'Boyle

Linda Mutema

Date: 19/3/07

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | Canterbury Christ Church University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Supplementary Prescribing for Allied Health Professionals |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | PT |
| Date of Visit | 4 th April 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Miss Pamela Sabine – Head of Podiatry and Podiatric Surgery – South East Essex PCT Mrs Kathryn Burgess – Head of Division of Medical Imaging & Radiography – University of Liverpool. |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Miss Daljit Mahoon |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Mrs Jenny Hawkins (Chair) – Canterbury Christ Church University Mrs Shelagh Titchener – Director of Academic Planning and Quality. Dr Peter Merchant – Principle Lecturer, English Ms Judith Durrant – Programme Director, Professional Development Ms Karen Stansfield – NMC Representative Ms Carole Bennett-Rose – Visiting Lecturer, University of Central England Mrs Geraldine Francis – Principle Lecturer, Kingston University. |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|---------------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | Max 25 |
|---|---------------|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Condition:

The assessment structure for the course needs to be clarified so that it is explicit to students as to what is required to pass each module.

Reason:

The assessment structure was not clearly articulated within the documentation which led to confusion on what was required for students to pass each module. This needs to be more clearly outlined.

Deadline to meet condition: 14th May 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.9 Where students participate as patients or clients in practical and clinical teaching, appropriate protocols must be used to obtain their consent.

Recommendation:

The programme team should consider the development of a more formalised method of obtaining student consent.

Reason:

Through discussions with the programme team it was made apparent that consent from students was obtained, however the team agreed to consider devising a more formal way of obtaining consent which the visitors encourage.

Recommendation 2

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Recommendation:

That the programme team re-visit the wording of the module descriptors to better reflect the necessary learning outcomes.

Reason:

The visitors felt that some of the wording used within the module descriptors could be improved to enable students to have a clearer understanding of how the module descriptors reflect the learning outcomes.

COMMENDATIONS

1) The programme team have engaged in a very positive way with the students and have acted on feedback from them.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

**Miss Pamela Sabine
Mrs Kathryn Burgess**

Date: 11/04/07

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | Cardiff University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Dip HE Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | Fulltime |
| Date of Visit | 20-22 March 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Stephen Oates, Clinical Educator, Plymouth Hospitals NHS Trust (Operating Department Practice) Susan Thompson, Lecturer, St John University (Occupational Therapy) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Chris Hipkins |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Penny Joyce, Principal Lecturer, University of Portsmouth (College of ODP) Nick Clark, Lecturer, Anglia Ruskin University (College of ODP) |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|-----------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 50 |
|---|-----------|

ALL CONDITIONS APPLY

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection criteria, including criminal conviction checks

Condition: The University needs to make the self-declaration process for keeping CRB checks up to date more transparent.

Reason: The documentation does not currently make it clear that students are required to complete annual declarations to keep their CRB check up to date.

Suggested dates for submission to ETP: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.12 The Resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, IT facilities (including internet access), must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: The University should take steps to ensure that all students have easy access to the Blackboard virtual learning environment.

Reason: Many learning resources are made available to students via Blackboard, however not all students have easy access to Blackboard at their practice placements.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The University should build upon its unique portfolio of programmes and setting by developing with some urgency an inter-professional learning programme for all four disciplines under review and within the University as a whole.

Reason: There is currently little evidence that inter-professional learning takes place, however the wide range of programmes offered and the unique physical location of all the programmes in the same building provide very good opportunities for this situation to change.

SET 5. Practice Placements

5.7.4 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure.

Condition: The documentation should be revised to make it clear who is responsible for which elements of the clinical assessment.

Reason: The documentation does not currently make this clear. The students and the practice placement providers would benefit from this being made more transparent.

Condition: The role of the logbook as a means of monitoring student progress on the practice placements could be made more explicit in the documentation.

Reason: The documentation does not currently make this clear. The students and the practice placement providers would benefit from this being made more transparent.

COMMENDATIONS

- **The audit system for practice placements is a good example of best practice.**
- **The placements allow movement to maximise the learning experience for the student.**
- **The enthusiasm for the programme expressed by the students is a positive reflection on the commitment of the course team and placement providers.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Stephen Oates

Susan Thompson

Date: 26 March 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Cardiff University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | PG Dip Occupational Therapy BSc (Hons) Occupational Therapy (F/T) |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | BSc (Hons) - Fulltime PG Dip - Full time accelerated |
| Date of Visit | 20-22 March 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Carol Walker, Retired Head of Occupational Therapy, York St John University Bernadette Waters, Director of Education and Head of Occupational Therapy, University of Southampton Susan Thompson, Lecturer, St John University (Occupational Therapy) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Mandy Hargood |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Professor Tony Cryer, Cardiff University, Chair Remy Reyes, Professional Officer, College of Occupational Therapists (C)(COT) Helen Stoneley, Programme Leader, Occupational Therapy, University of Derby (COT) Jo-Anne Supyk, Senior Lecturer in Occupational Therapy, University of Salford (COT) |

Scope of visit (*please tick*)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|-------------------------------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | PGDip 25 BSc FT 64 |
|---|-------------------------------|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 6. Assessment Standards

6.6 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement.

Condition: The regulations regarding professional suitability must be made more explicit in the programme documentation for the PG Dip and brought into line with the other OT programmes.

Reason: Professional suitability is currently covered adequately in the other OT programmes but not in the PG Dip.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 21 May 2007

Suggested dates for submission to ETP: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2. Programme admissions

2.2.5 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including Accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms.

Recommendation: The documentation should be revised to ensure that the procedures for Accreditation of Prior Learning are clearly articulated and transparent to prospective students.

Reason: The documentation does not currently include procedures for Accreditation of Prior Learning.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: The policy for staff development, both within the school and the wider university, should be more clearly demonstrated.

Reason: The current staff development opportunities available for staff, and the support that they received to take them up, was not clearly articulated in any of the documentation.

3.11 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Recommendation: The policy for attendance monitoring should be clearly articulated in the documentation.

Reason: The procedure for monitoring attendance is currently unclear.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The University should build upon its unique portfolio of programmes and setting by developing with some urgency an inter-professional learning programme for all four disciplines under review and within the University as a whole.

Reason: There is currently little evidence that inter-professional learning takes place. The wide range of programmes offered and the unique physical location of all the programmes in the same building provide very good opportunities for this situation to change.

COMMENDATIONS

- **The development of the practice placements database for Wales is an example of best practice.**
- **The development of non traditional practice placements in occupational therapy to support professional innovation and the issues around placement capacity is excellent.**
- **The integrated model of curriculum delivery, which underpins the holistic occupational basis for professional practice, is commended.**
- **The collaborative nature of the teams across the three institutions is commended.**
- **The quality of the documentation was greatly appreciated by the Visitors.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

**Carol Walker
Bernadette Waters
Susan Thompson**

Date: 26 March 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | Cardiff University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Diagnostic Radiography & Imaging BSc(Hons) Radiotherapy & Oncology |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | Full time |
| Date of Visit | 20-22 March 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Derek Adrian-Harris, Director of Radiography, University of Portsmouth Russell Hart, Radiotherapy Services Manager, Nottingham University Hospital |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Chris Hipkins |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Professor Tony Cryer, Cardiff University (Chair) Julie O'Boyle, The College of Radiographers Graham Morgan, The College of Radiographers |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | Diagnostic Radiography = 60 Radiotherapy and Oncology = 22 |
|---|---|

ALL CONDITIONS SAMPLE

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 5. Practice placements

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: The University must put in place a more formal mechanism for both approving and monitoring practice placements.

Reason: The current process is informal and inconsistently applied. There is insufficient emphasis on regular, structured monitoring.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 21 May 2007

Suggested dates for submission to ETP: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.6 A programme for staff development must be in place to ensure continuing professional and research development.

Recommendation: Professional development opportunities to ensure that staff maintain clinical currency should be extended to all staff and greater support for staff undertaking this professional development should be put in place.

Reason: Currently some staff are engaged in developing and maintaining the currency of their clinical skills however this is by no means the case for all staff. The programme would benefit from increased emphasis on this area.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The University should build upon its unique portfolio of programmes and setting by developing with some urgency an inter-professional learning programme for all four disciplines under review and within the University as a whole.

Reason: There is currently little evidence that inter-professional learning takes place, however the wide range of programmes offered and the unique physical location of all the programmes in the same building provide very good opportunities for this situation to change.

COMMENDATIONS

- **The in-practice IT system for student and placement provider feedback and interaction during practice placements is excellent.**
- **The image library for diagnostics is excellent.**
- **The enthusiastic support for students offered by the programme team is commended.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Derek Adrian-Harris
Russell Hart

Date: 26 March 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Central England in Partnership with West Midlands Ambulance Service NHS Trust |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Foundation Degree in Health and Social Care (Paramedic Science) (for qualified IHCD ambulance technicians) |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | Full time |
| Date of Visit | 19th and 20th April 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | October 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Marcus Bailey (Paramedic) Paul Bates (Paramedic) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Chris Hipkins |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Prof. Graham Rogers (chair) Ian Teague (external – paramedic) Jan Harris (external – academic) Fréd Lawrence (external – academic) Timothy James (University representative) Sue Lillyman (University representative) |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|------------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 2 x 12 P/A |
|--|------------|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.11 Throughout the course of the programme, the education provider must have identified where attendance is mandatory and must have associated monitoring mechanisms in place.

Condition: The HEI must ensure students are aware of the consequences for non-attendance in both theory and practice by amending the student handbook accordingly.

Reason: There is a policy in place for theory and practice but it does not detail the consequences for non-attendance for the student. It should also specify the roles and responsibility of the HEI and partner Trust.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition: The HEI must provide a written policy for the assessment and moderation of the work books.

Reason: The course programme utilises work books for student learning and covering key material. In order to ensure students are developing and demonstrating standards of proficiency. The process for assessment of the workbook, moderation and action planning should be detailed.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.7.5 for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The HEI must produce a plan for recruitment of an external examiner for this programme.

Reason: Currently the course team are awaiting university approval of this pathway. The HPC team require evidence of active recruitment.

| | |
|--|---------------------|
| Deadline for conditions to be met: | 21 May 2007 |
| Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: | 31 May 2007 |
| Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: | 12 June 2007 |

COMMENDATIONS

1. **Partnership working** – there clear evidence of cohesive thinking and work related to the needs of the organisations and more importantly the students. The thought process for the programme has been given clear thought.
2. **Documentation and preparation** – the work of the visiting team has been made extremely easy in relation to the standard of documentation. The detail and depth of the information provides reassurance in relation to achieving the HPC SOP's for paramedic.
3. **Innovation** – the programme provides many avenues of clear thought and challenging of traditional approaches. The course work-books provide a new way of balancing operational, student and educational needs.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Marcus Bailey
Paul Bates

Date: 20 April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Essex |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Biomedical Sciences (Integrated) |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | FT |
| Date of Visit | 18-19 January 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Robert Munro (Biomedical Science – Academic) Mary Popeck (Biomedical Science – Retired Clinician) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Osama Ammar |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Paul Scott (Chair) (Dean - Faculty of Science of Engineering Dean) Brigitte Palmer (Secretary) Kirstie Sceats (Observer) Debi Roberson (Faculty of Psychology) Gerry Davis (Faculty of Health and Human Science) Jo Jackson (Faculty of Health and Human Science) Katherine Guays-Atkins (Student) Alan Wainwright (IBMS representative) Jim Cunningham (IBMS academic representative) Peter Ruddy (IBMS clinical representative) |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|----|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 30 |
|--|----|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the word 'clinical' from the programme title.

Reason: Clinical Science is also a HPC regulated profession and there is some concern that, through the use of the word 'clinical' in the title, an applicant might not understand that this programme will lead to eligibility to register as a Biomedical Scientist.

2.2.1 apply selection and entry criteria, including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the materials used to advertise the programme to clearly indicate that although entry to the programme will be possible at either IELTS 6.0 or 6.5, entry to the HPC Register will require an IELTS score of 7.0.

Reason: The Visitors felt the entry requirement to the programme was sufficiently clear but that a student might not take steps to ensure their language proficiency developed unless the requirement for entry to the register was also clear.

SET 3. *Programme management and resource standards*

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how University of Essex has taken responsibility for the management of the placement year.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent that the placement environments were managed effectively. However, much of this management was performed by placement staff and the Visitors felt University of Essex needed to take ownership of all placement arrangements to ensure parity of student experience.

3.8 The facilities needed to ensure the welfare and well-being of students must be both adequate and accessible.

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how University of Essex has taken responsibility for the management of the placement environment. In particular, this should include information on how student welfare and well-being is supported in placement.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent that there was some disparity in student experience on placement and the Visitors felt University of Essex needed to take ownership of all placement arrangements to ensure students have equal access to support mechanisms.

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|---|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2007-01-26 | b | APV | APV | Visitors Report - University of Essex - BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

3.12 The resources provided, both on and off site, must adequately support the required learning and teaching activities of the programme.

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate how University of Essex has taken responsibility for the management of the placement environment. In particular, this should include information on how University of Essex ensures the adequacy of resources at placement.

Reason: Through discussion, it became apparent that there was some disparity in student experience on placement and the Visitors felt University of Essex needed to take ownership of all placement arrangements to ensure resources and associated learning opportunities were similar at each site.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the mechanisms University of Essex has in place to approve and monitor placement environments.

Reason: Through discussion it was clear that University of Essex had not formalised the processes they followed to ensure the placement environments met and continue to meet threshold standards for appropriateness. As these processes were not documented, the Visitors did not feel able to determine if the number, duration and range of placements was appropriate to the learning outcomes as it was not clearly documented how University of Essex takes responsibility for approving and monitoring placements.

5.7.5 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of communication and lines of responsibility.

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the role of University of Essex as first point of contact for students and placement staff.

Reason: It became apparent, through shared responsibility between University of Essex and the placement providers, that the Programme Director was not always the primary contact for placement questions and problems. The Visitors felt that University of Essex must document its role in managing the placement experience through a placement co-ordinator on the University staff.

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the role of University of Essex in the management of practice placements. In particular, the role of University of Essex in the collaboration must be made clear.

Reason: Though collaboration between University of Essex and practice placement providers was evident, the Visitors felt that University of Essex needed to clarify the enhanced role it will play in the collaboration for an integrated biomedical science programme.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

6.5 There must be effective mechanisms in place to assure appropriate standards in the assessment.

Condition: The programme team must revisit and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly indicate how academic staff members are involved in the moderation of the assessment of the practice portfolio.

Reason: Through discussion, the programme team indicated that moderation was taking place, however, the process was not documented in the definitive documentation. The Visitors felt the process needed to be formalised to ensure assessment standards were quality assured.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 24th May 2007

Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:

28th March 2007 - Approval of Report

5th July 2007 - Approval of Programme

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.3 There must be a named programme leader who has overall responsibility for the programme and should be either on the relevant part of the HPC Register (for the following professions: arts therapists, biomedical scientists, chiropractors and podiatrists, dieticians, occupational therapists, orthoptists, paramedics, physiotherapists, prosthetists and orthotists and radiographers) or otherwise appropriately qualified and experienced.

Recommendation: The programme leader should seek registration with the HPC through the appropriate route.

Reason: Currently the programme leader is appropriately qualified to undertake the role of managing and developing the programme, however, in attaining registration with the HPC, the inclusion of profession specific skills and knowledge would enhance the programme's potential to develop with the profession.

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|---|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2007-01-26 | b | APV | APV | Visitors Report - University of Essex - BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

Recommendation: University of Essex should consider the appointment of at least one HPC registered Biomedical Scientist as a full time member of academic staff.

Reason: The input of part time lecturers to the programme ensures that profession specific knowledge is central to the programme. The Visitors felt, however, the programme would benefit significantly from full time members of academic staff who would be better able to dedicate more time to the development and management of the programme.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Recommendation: The programme team should make students aware of the standards of the HPC and the IBMS in the first year of the programme.

Reason: Through discussion with students, it became clear that some were not aware of the role of the regulator or the professional body until they had gained practice experience. The Visitors felt although these subjects were included in the summer school that the students needed the information consolidated at an early point in the programme.

4.4 The curriculum must remain relevant to current practice.

Recommendation: The programme team should integrate subject matter surrounding the biology of disease into the final year of the programme.

Reason: The Visitors felt the third year of the programme directed students towards research topics with a biological or bio-molecular focus. In order to reinforce biomedical science students' knowledge of the biology of disease, the Visitors suggest this subject matter is integrated into the final year in the Issues in Biomedical Science module or the research project.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.1 Practice placements must be integral to the programme.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider applying credit to the placement assessments to further demonstrate the integration of the placement year in the programme.

Reason: The Visitors noted that with a pass/fail criterion the effort and level of attainment in the placement year was currently unrecognised. In particular the Visitors felt the named award referenced the placement learning and therefore should rely on the assessment of the placement in the classification of honours.

Commendations

The Visitors commend the high quality of the documentation submitted for the validation and approval event.

The Visitors commend the evident enthusiasm and commitment of the trainers in the placement environment.

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|---|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2007-01-26 | b | APV | APV | Visitors Report - University of Essex - BSc (Hons) Biomedical Science | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Robert Munro

Mary Popeck

Date: 24/01/07

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Glasgow Caledonian University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Non-medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 9) Non-medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 10) Non-medical Prescribing (SCQF Level 11) |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | PT |
| Date of Visit | 11 th April 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Robert Fellows (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) David Whitmore (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) – <i>unable to attend Visit owing to work unforeseen work commitments.</i> |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Osama Ammar |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Irene Bonnar (Chair), Associate Dean of Quality, School of the Built and Natural Environment, GCU Elaine Skea (Secretary), Assistant School Manager – Programme Support, School of Nursing, Midwifery & Community Health, GCU Susan Winterburn (HLSP/NMC), Senior Nursing Lecturer, School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Sheffield Carroll Siu (External Panel Member), Senior Lecturer, Institute of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Brighton Carole Doyle (Internal Panel Member), Senior Lecturer/Teaching Fellow, Caledonian Business School, GCU |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|---|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 60 per intake, 10% of which will be AHPs |
|---|---|

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to correct the reference to the Department of Health document, *Outline curriculum for training programmes to prepare Allied Health Professionals as Supplementary Prescribers*.

Reason: The programme documentation submitted attributed the above document to the HPC. As the HPC does not issue curriculum guidance for programmes of study, this reference will be need to corrected throughout the programme documentation.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.3 The practice placement settings must provide:

5.3.1 a safe environment; and

5.3.2 safe and effective practice.

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the process for approving and monitoring placements. The placement approval and monitoring mechanisms must ensure the practice environments are safe, provide safe and effective practice and are compliant with suitable anti-discriminatory and equal opportunities policies.

Reason: In discussion it became clear that in the previous version of the programme there was no process to approve and monitor placement environments. In order to meet the standards of education and training, the programme team must devise a process to ensure appropriate practice placement standards are being met.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31st May 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.1 give both the applicant and the education provider the information they require to make an informed choice about whether to make, or take up the offer of a place on a programme

Recommendation: The programme team should consider the addition of suggested pre-reading in the area of pharmacology to applicants to the programme.

Reason: In discussion with students, it was commented that they felt they would have benefited from a suggested list of reading on pharmacology before the commencement of the programme as the subject area was considered new and therefore challenging at the outset by the majority of the students.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.13 The learning resources, including the stock of periodicals and subject books, and IT facilities, including internet access, must be appropriate to the curriculum and must be readily available to students and staff.

Recommendation: Glasgow Caledonian University should consider reviewing the opening hours of the learning resource centre to increase the hours available to students to access facilities and resources.

Reason: In the tour of facilities it was noted that the library opening hours were suitable for access to the resources. However, the Visitor felt that certain student groups, such as those working on shift patterns, may benefit from increased flexibility in the opening hours of the learning resource centre.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.8.3 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider reviewing the development of the training made available to Designated Medical Supervisors to continue to include the opportunity for DMPs to attend the University, but also pursue, as planned, other methods of disseminating information.

Reason: In discussion the programme team displayed the commitment to the training of the Designated Medical Supervisors. It was stated that uptake on University based training was low and accordingly other methods of training DMPs were being explored. In the meeting with a DMP, indications were made that University based training would be highly valued and felt the programme team should be made aware of this demand and should consider continuing attempts to train at the University.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Bob Fellows

Date: 17th April 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | Leeds Metropolitan University |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Non Medical Prescribing |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | PT |
| Date of Visit | 9 May 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Jane Topham (Paramedic) Dugald MacInnes (Lay) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Abigail Creighton |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Terry Moran, Associate Dean & Head of School of Social Sciences (Chair) Alison Bohan, Principal Officer, Academic Quality & Research, Faculty of Health (Report writer) Jacqui Parkin, Administrative Officer Faculty of Health (Course administrator) Alison Caswell, Group Head Public and Environmental Health, Faculty of Health (Internal panel member) Julie Rogers, Clinical Services Manager, MSK Services, Leeds Primary Care Trust (External panel member) |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|---|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through annual monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | | | |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|
| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|------------|-----------|------------|

| | | | |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 None | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|---|---------------------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 50 (30-40% AHPs) |
|---|---------------------|

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.4 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including appropriate academic and/or professional entry standards;

Condition: The programme team should review the admissions criteria to ensure that it accurately reflects and distinguishes between the different requirements for the level three and masters level programmes.

Reason: The entry criteria listed in the programme specification and approval document does not currently detail the different requirements for studying at level three and masters level. The module descriptor for the masters level module includes an additional pre-requisite of 'a related first degree or the proven facility to function at level M' and the Faculty CPD scheme definitive document includes first degree requirements. Through discussions with the programme team, it became clear that a prospective students' potential to study at different levels would be assessed as part of the selection process and they would receive guidance on the most appropriate level. Consequently the visitors felt that the programme admissions criteria should be updated to ensure that applicants were clear of the entry standards for the two different versions of the programme.

2.2.5 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria, including accreditation of Prior Learning and other inclusion mechanisms

Condition: The programme team should review the ap(e)l procedures to ensure that students who are eligible for ap(e)l, are still able to meet the standard of proficiency for supplementary prescribing*. In particular, the programme team should clarify the attendance and assessment requirements following the application of ap(e)l.

** Registrants must know and be able to apply the key concepts which are relevant to safe and effective practice as a supplementary prescriber in order to have their name annotated on the Register.*

Reason: In the meeting with the programme team it was confirmed that students could ap(e)l up to 50% of the programme and that this could include both the taught and clinical parts of the programme. It was explained that if a student received ap(e)l for 50% of the programme, then the 80% attendance requirement would be waived. Whilst the visitors were aware that this would only happen in exceptional circumstances, they felt that there needed to be a safeguard to ensure that students would still attend the clinical component of the programme and complete the assessment. The visitors recognised the value of ap(e)l for parts of the programme, but felt that any reduction in the time spent in clinical practice would not enable students to develop into safe and effective practitioners.

Deadline for Conditions to be met: Friday 8 June 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 21 June 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5 July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2007-05-10 | a | EDU | APV | LMU - SP - Visitors report | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider including the course programme delivery team details in the course handbook, so that students are aware of the wider programme team and their relevance to particular parts of the programme.

Reason: The Faculty CPD scheme definitive document included a wide range of CVs which showed the number and expertise of the staff who deliver this programme. In the meeting with the programme team, it was explained how these staff contributed to the programme delivery. The visitors felt that the information in the course handbook, which listed a team of four, could be elaborated on, so that students were clear which staff would be responsible for the delivery of the taught part of the programme.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.5 The number, duration and range of placements must be appropriate to the achievement of the learning outcomes.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider expressing the 12 clinical days, as hours, to ensure that all students receive sufficient support, teaching and supervision from their Designated Medical Practitioner (DMP) to allow them to achieve the learning outcomes.

Reason: The programme team do not currently provide any interpretation or guidance on what constitutes a 'working day' in practice. To eliminate variations (e.g. six hour days compared to twelve hour days), the visitors suggest that the programme team consider equating days to hours so that all students clinical experience allows them to meet the learning outcomes.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.1 The assessment design and procedures must assure that the student can demonstrate fitness to practise.

Recommendation: At the next available opportunity, the Faculty should reconsider the wording used in the 40-49% descriptor in the assessment criteria, to guarantee that they are producing graduates who are safe, effective and competent.

Reason: In the meeting with the programme team, it was explained how the assessment criteria detailed in the documentation was not used to assess clinical competencies. Clinical competencies are assessed on a pass/fail basis, so the visitors were confident that this programme's assessment ensured that students were fit to practise, upon completion. However, as these assessment criteria are used more widely within the Faculty, the visitors suggested that it be reviewed at the next appropriate opportunity to ensure that the references to 'levels of supervision' were amended, removed or edited with a caveat, so that it was explicit that those who received a grade within the 40-49% band were able to practice as safe and effective autonomous practitioners.

COMMENDATIONS

- **The students were positive and complimentary about the programme and staff support**
- **The programme team, senior staff and placement educators contributed to a constructive, open and friendly discussion throughout the visit.**

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Jane Topham

Dugald MacInnes

Date: 10 May 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Northumbria at Newcastle |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | FT/PT |
| Date of Visit | 2 nd -3 rd May 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Dr Robert Williams (Biomedical Scientist, Educationalist) Dr Mary Macdonald (Biomedical Scientist, Clinician) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Osama Ammar |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Dr Colin Creasy (Chair), Associate Dean, Staff and Student Affairs, Northumbria University Mrs Catherine Barker (minutes), Principle Administrator, School of Applied Science, Northumbria University |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|----|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 10 |
|--|----|

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including, criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate that all students on the Applied Biomedical Science pathway must undergo criminal convictions checks.

Reason: At present, criminal convictions are indicated in the programme documentation to be carried out when necessary at the discretion of the employer. In order to meet this standard of education and training, all students must undergo the criminal convictions check and the documentation must be updated to reflect this.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.2 The programme must reflect the philosophy, values, skills and knowledge base as articulated in the curriculum guidance for the profession.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to correct the reference to the Standards of conduct, performance and ethics and to replace outdated terminology regarding state registration.

Reason: The programme documentation in most instances provided correct terminology and document references. However, in several instances reference was made to the previous system of regulation which included state registration. Further, students may be misled by the existing inaccurate reference to the Standards of Conduct rather than Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.7.4 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placements which will include information about and understanding of the following: the assessment procedures including the implications of, and any action to be taken in the case of failure; and

6.7.1 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for student progression and achievement within the programme;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the implications of failure of the Applied Biomedical Science pathway. In particular the programme documentation should provide information on the process for referral in the final year and the process for credit transfer in order to achieve the Biomedical Science pathway award.

Reason: The programme documentation makes reference to the Biomedical Science pathway awards as being accessible upon failure of the professional practice elements of the Applied Biomedical Science pathway. However, the Visitors felt this information needs to

make explicit the options available to students and explain the process of credit transfer and at which points it is possible.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the external examiner appointed to the programme must be from the appropriate part of the HPC Register unless otherwise agreed.

Reason: The programme team evidenced the appointment of an external examiner from the relevant part of the Register and understood this to be a requirement of the HPC. However, in order to meet the standard of education and training the stipulation must be clearly stated in the documentation

Deadline for conditions to be met: 21st June 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007

Commendations

The Visitors commend the implementation of the "training the trainers" programme and the high level of collaboration between the University, placement educators, employers and external lecturers. The Visitors felt the programme exhibited a sound model of collaboration.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Robert Williams

Mary Macdonald

Date: 4th May 2007

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|---|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2007-05-14 | b | APV | APV | Visitors' Report - Northumbria University - BSc (Hons) Applied Biomedical Science | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | University of Paisley |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Non-Medical Prescribing |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | Part time (26 days on campus) Blended Learning (min 12 days on campus) |
| Date of Visit | 1 May 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | David Whitmore, Paramedic Gordon Pollard, Paramedic |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Chris Hipkins |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Professor Malcolm Crowe, Chair Nina Anderson, University of Paisley |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|--------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 35 x 2 |
|--|--------|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 *Programme admissions*

2.2.1 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including evidence of a good command of written and spoken English;

2.2.2 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including criminal convictions checks; and

2.2.3 The admission procedures must apply selection and entry criteria including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The employer declaration must be amended to make it clear that the employee/student must have an up to date enhanced CRB check before they can commence the course, and that the employer believes their level of English language and health is sufficient for the course.

Reason: The Visitors were advised that CRB checks are completed, however this was not clear in the documentation. It was also not clear how the University ensures that students have a sufficient level of English language and meet relevant health requirements.

SET 6. *Assessment standards*

6.7.3 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award to not provide eligibility for admission to the HPC Register.

Condition: The documentation should be updated to make it clear that aegrotat awards are not available for this programme.

Reason: This was not clear in the documentation.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31 May 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 12 June 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 12 June 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

6.7.5 Assessment regulations must clearly specify requirements for the appointment of an external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC register.

Recommendation: That before an external examiner is appointed the course team liaise with the HPC to establish the credentials required to meet HPC standards.

Reason: The programme team currently intends to appoint an external examiner from the relevant part of the HPC register, however the HPC is currently consulting on a change to this standard so before an external examiner is appointed the HEI should check the latest requirements.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training. We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

David Whitmore
Gordon Pollard

Date: 1 May 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|---|
| Name of education provider | University of Plymouth |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Dip HE Operating Department Practice |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | FT |
| Date of Visit | 28 February – 1 st March 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Norma Brook (Educationalist) Julie Weir (Clinician) |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Osama Ammar, Education Officer Sam Mars, Policy Officer (Observing) |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Ruth Clemow, Acting Associate Dean of Faculty of Health and Social Work (Chair) Lisa Williams, Senior Administrator, Quality (Secretary) Claire Knapman, Administrative Assistant, Quality Paul Wicker, Edgehill University (External Assessor) John Tarrant, Bournemouth University (External Assessor) Penny Joyce, University of Portsmouth (CODP representative) |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| New profession to the HPC | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Date
2007-04-26

Ver.
c

Dept/Cmte
APV

Doc Type
APV

Title
Visitors' Report - University of
Plymouth - Dip HE Operating
Department Practice

Status
Final
DD: None

Int. Aud.
Public
RD: None

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 Annual Monitoring Visitors' Report for academic year 2005-2006 raised concern over standards of education and training 2, 5 and 6. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 30 | | |

ALL CONDITIONS MET

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approval event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the requirement for an Enhanced Criminal Records Bureau check to be completed as a component of the entry requirements for the programme.

Reason: The programme documentation referred to the criminal records check and it was clearly part of the entry criteria for the programme. However, the documentation did not indicate the criminal records check would be “enhanced” and the Visitors felt that the requirement would be clearer in the documentation if it was separated under a different heading from occupational health checks.

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.2 The programme must be managed effectively.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the regional nature of the delivery of the programme. In particular an explanation and a rationale must be provided for the concurrent delivery of three modules from the first year of the programme at the centre at Truro.

Reason: In discussion with students and the programme team it became clear that eight students per cohort received lectures for three first year modules from staff at the centre in Truro. This arrangement was not made clear in the programme documentation. The Visitors felt that, in order to make a determination of how effectively the programme is managed, further information regarding the regional nature of delivery would be required. An overview of the teaching of academic content, staff involvement and learning and teaching resources would assist the Visitors in making their determination.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include the placement audit pro-forma and a description of the process of approving and monitoring placement provision.

Reason: Through discussion, it was clear that the programme team and the practice quality development department were working to ensure practice placement standards and were developing the quality mechanisms to improve the process in future. However, in the documentation it was not made clear how the process currently operated and the Visitors felt the programme documentation must clearly explain how practice placement standards are maintained.

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|--|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2007-04-26 | c | APV | APV | Visitors' Report - University of Plymouth - Dip HE Operating Department Practice | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

5.9 There must be collaboration between the education provider and practice placement providers.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate and illustrate the relationship and the process of collaboration between the programme team and practice placement educators. In particular, this redraft will require the updating of the flowchart featured on page 13 of the reference document A15.

Reason: Through discussion with the practice placement educators and the associate dean for practice quality development, it was clear that there would be imminent changes to the relationship between the practice educators and the programme team owing to changes at national and contractual level the roles of the existing practice clinical educators and the link tutor. In order to ensure the arrangements for collaboration for the September 2007 cohort continued to meet this standard of education and training, the Visitors felt the new arrangement, once agreed, must be submitted to the HPC.

SET 6. Assessment standards

6.4 The measurement of student performance and progression must be an integral part of the wider process of monitoring and evaluation, and use objective criteria.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to include the marking scheme/criteria for the formative and summative assessment elements of the practice portfolio.

Reason: The Visitors felt that the assessment of practice competencies which formed a component of the portfolio was clear in the submitted documentation. However, it was felt by the Visitors that the evaluation process of additional components of the portfolio, such as reflective evidence, was not sufficient. The Visitors felt that the programme team should clearly identify the purpose of the portfolio as a programme component and which elements are formatively and summatively assessed.

6.7.3 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for an aegrotat award not to provide eligibility for admission to the Register; and

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the title of the aegrotat award that will not lead to eligibility for registration with the HPC.

Reason: Through discussion it became clear the title for an aegrotat award would be Diploma of Higher Education in Health Studies, however this was not made clear in the documentation. There is reference to the Certificate of Higher Education if students had not achieved sufficient credit for the diploma award. However, the HEI's academic regulations relating to the aegrotat award should be made clear in the documentation.

6.7.5 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate the stipulation that at least one external examiner must be from the appropriate part of the HPC Register.

Reason: The documentation made it clear that the current external examiner was appropriate registered. However, the Visitors felt that in order to ensure that this standard continued to be met in future the programme documentation must include the stipulation for registration.

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|--|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2007-04-26 | c | APV | APV | Visitors' Report - University of Plymouth - Dip HE Operating Department Practice | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

Deadline for Conditions to be met: 14th May 2007
Expected dates for submission to ETP/C:

For approval of the report: 31st May 2007
For approval of the programme: 5th July 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

SET 3. Programme management and resource standards

3.4 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff in place to deliver an effective programme.

3.5 Subject areas must be taught by staff with relevant specialist expertise and knowledge.

Recommendation: The University of Plymouth should consider accelerating the appointment of a lecturer/practitioner who is a registered operating department practitioner.

Reason: The Visitors felt the programme was adequately resourced and had sufficient profession specific input. However, the Visitors felt that the programme team would be better able to support ODP students with the inclusion of more operating department practitioners on the academic staff delivering the programme and offering personal tutor support.

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.5 The delivery of the programme must assist autonomous and reflective thinking, and evidence based practice.

Recommendation: The programme team should consider separating personal development profile elements of the portfolio from the practice assessment documents.

Reason: In discussion with the students, it became apparent that the volume of information in the portfolio was at time considered cumbersome and over-complicated to complete. The Visitors suggest that by dividing the two elements of personal development profile and practice assessment documents, these feelings towards the portfolio might be adequately addressed.

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation: The programme should report any future changes to the interprofessional learning strategy to the HPC through the appropriate monitoring process.

Reason: In light of the changes occurring throughout the faculty with regard to interprofessional learning, the Visitors felt the programme team should ensure that HPC is kept up to date with the changes in the strategy and the impact upon this programme.

Commendations

| Date | Ver. | Dept/Cmte | Doc Type | Title | Status | Int. Aud. |
|------------|------|-----------|----------|--|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2007-04-26 | c | APV | APV | Visitors' Report - University of Plymouth - Dip HE Operating Department Practice | Final DD: None | Public RD: None |

The Visitors commend the strong relationship between the practice placement educators and the programme team. This relationship was strongly evidenced in discussion and by the innovation by the programme team and support provided by the placement providers in the production and dissemination of a DVD-ROM to help address the issue of placement educators not being able to find the time to attend regular updates at the university, which is common to placement-driven programmes.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Norma Brook

Julie Weir

Date: 2nd March 2007

ALL CONDITIONS MET

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Stirling |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Non-medical Prescribing |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | PT |
| Date of Visit | 12 th April 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Robert Fellows (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) David Whitmore (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) – <i>unable to attend visit owing to work unforeseen work commitments.</i> |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Osama Ammar |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Professor Andrew McAuley (Chair), Head of Department of Marketing Mrs Edna Docherty (Secretary), Academic Registrar's Office Ms Karen Stansfield (HLSP/NMC), Senior Lecturer, Sheffield Hallam University Dr Iain Ferguson (Internal Panel Member), Senior Lecturer, Department of Applied Social Science |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 82 per intake, 10% of which will be AHPs |
|--|--|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate a process for ensuring applicants to the programme will be able to meet occupational health requirements.

Reason: The programme documentation provided detailed information on entry requirements apart from occupational health testing. The Visitor felt the programme team would need to ensure that an applicant was made aware of any occupational health requirements or tests prior to commencing the programme.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the information provided on page 25 that indicates audits of placement environments performed by other education providers would be accepted. Further the programme team must submit additional information regarding the approval and monitoring processes for placement environments to indicate how they have been adapted to ensure HPC standards for placements are being met, such as ensuring compliance with equal-opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies.

Reason: In discussion it became clear the programme team would not accept audits of placement environments performed by other education providers. Accordingly, the Visitor felt this would need to be reflected in the documentation. Additionally, a system of approval and monitoring of placement environments is in place, but in discussion it was recognised that this would need to be augmented to ensure all HPC standards for placements were being fully met. Therefore, the Visitor feels information regarding these changes to the approval and monitoring processes are required to be submitted for scrutiny.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31st May 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007

Commendations

The Visitor commends:

- the innovation and quality of the virtual learning environment. A strong commitment has been made to e-learning and the members of staff supporting the VLE received very positive comments from the various groups that the HPC panel met at the Visit. Further evidence of the high quality of the learning package produced by this programme team can be found in the fact that it has been franchised to many other education providers across the UK.
- the quality and clarity of the submitted documentation. The HPC panel were impressed by the organisation and detail of the documentation in evidencing how the standards of education and training were met. Obvious care had been taken to cater to the needs of the HPC panel.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Bob Fellows

Date: 17th April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Stirling |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Non-medical Prescribing |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | PT |
| Date of Visit | 12 th April 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Robert Fellows (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) David Whitmore (Paramedic, Education Development Manager, London Ambulance Service) – <i>unable to attend Visit owing to work unforeseen work commitments.</i> |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Osama Ammar |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Professor Andrew McAuley (Chair), Head of Department of Marketing Mrs Edna Docherty (Secretary), Academic Registrar's Office Ms Karen Stansfield (HLSP/NMC), Senior Lecturer, Sheffield Hallam University Dr Iain Ferguson (Internal Panel Member), Senior Lecturer, Department of Applied Social Science |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|--|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | 82 per intake, 10% of which will be AHPs |
|--|--|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

SET 2 Programme admissions

The admission procedures must:

2.2.3 apply selection and entry criteria, including compliance with any health requirements.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to clearly articulate a process for ensuring applicants to the programme will be able to meet occupational health requirements.

Reason: The programme documentation provided detailed information on entry requirements apart from occupational health testing. The Visitor felt the programme team would need to ensure that an applicant was made aware of any occupational health requirements or tests prior to commencing the programme.

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.6 The education provider must maintain a thorough and effective system for approving and monitoring all placements.

5.13 The placement providers must have an equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policy in relation to candidates and students, together with an indication of how this will be implemented and monitored.

Condition: The programme team must redraft and resubmit the programme documentation to remove the information provided on page 25 that indicates audits of placement environments performed by other education providers would be accepted. Further the programme team must submit additional information regarding the approval and monitoring processes for placement environments to indicate how they have been adapted to ensure HPC standards for placements are being met, such as ensuring compliance with equal opportunities and anti-discriminatory policies.

Reason: In discussion it became clear the programme team would not accept audits of placement environments performed by other education providers. Accordingly, the Visitor felt this would need to be reflected in the documentation. Additionally, a system of approval and monitoring of placement environments is in place, but in discussion it was recognised that this would need to be augmented to ensure all HPC standards for placements were being fully met. Therefore, the Visitor feels information regarding these changes to the approval and monitoring processes are required to be submitted for scrutiny.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31st May 2007

Expected date visitors' report submitted to Panel for approval: 31st May 2007

Expected date programme submitted to Panel for approval: 5th July 2007

Commendations

The Visitor commends:

- the innovation and quality of the virtual learning environment. A strong commitment has been made to e-learning and the members of staff supporting the VLE received very positive comments from the various groups that the HPC panel met at the Visit. Further evidence of the high quality of the learning package produced by this programme team can be found in the fact that it has been franchised to many other education providers across the UK.
- the quality and clarity of the submitted documentation. The HPC panel were impressed by the organisation and detail of the documentation in evidencing how the standards of education and training were met. Obvious care had been taken to cater to the needs of the HPC panel.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met).

Visitors' signatures:

Bob Fellows

Date: 17th April 2007

Health Professions Council

Visitors' report

| | |
|---|--|
| Name of education provider | University of Teesside |
| Name and titles of programme(s) | Dip HE Operating Department Practitioner |
| Mode of Delivery (FT/PT) | FT |
| Date of Visit | 28 th – 28 th March 2007 |
| Proposed date of approval to commence | September 2007 |
| Name of HPC visitors attending (including member type and professional area) | Mr Alan Mount Mrs Julie Weir |
| HPC Executive officer(s) (in attendance) | Miss Daljit Mahoon |
| Joint panel members in attendance (name and delegation): | Dr Derek Simpson – (Chair) Dean, School of Computing Ms Fiona Terry – (Secretary) Centre for learning & Quality Enhancement |

Scope of visit (please tick)

| | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| New programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| New Profession | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| Major change to existing programme | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Visit initiated through Annual Monitoring | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of meetings held

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Senior personnel of provider with responsibility for resources for the programme | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Programme team | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Placements providers and educators | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Students (current or past as appropriate) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation of facilities inspected

| | Yes | No | N/A |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Library learning centre | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| IT facilities | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Specialist teaching accommodation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Confirmation that particular requirements/specific instructions (if any) of the Education and Training Committee that have been explored e.g. specific aspects arising from annual monitoring reports.

| Requirement (please insert detail) | Yes | No | N/A |
|------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

| | |
|--|--------|
| Proposed student cohort intake number please state | Max 30 |
|--|--------|

The following summarises the key outcomes of the Approvals event and provides reasons for the decision.

CONDITIONS

Condition 1

SET 2 Programme admissions

2.2.2 apply selection and entry criteria, including criminal convictions checks;

Condition:

There needs to be consistency within the documentation that prospective students will be required to complete an 'enhanced' CRB clearance check. The programme team must redraft and submit documentation to ensure this condition is met.

Reason:

References made within the documentation referring to CRB checks were inconsistent in stating the students will be required to complete an 'enhanced' CRB clearance check. This needs to be clearly stipulated and consistent within the documentation.

Condition 2

SET 4. Curriculum Standards

4.1 The learning outcomes must ensure that those who successfully complete the programme meet the standards of proficiency for their part of the Register.

Condition:

References to the HPC Standards of Proficiency need to be included and more explicit within the student documents i.e; module outlines, student handbook and student practice portfolio.

Reason:

It was not clearly stipulated within the documentation the relevance of HPC Standards of Proficiency. This needs to be more explicit.

Condition 3

SET 5. Practice placements standards

5.2 There must be an adequate number of appropriately qualified and experienced staff at the placement.

5.8 Unless other arrangements are agreed, practice placement educators:

5.8.1 have relevant qualification and experience;

5.8.2 are appropriately registered; and

5.8.3 undertake appropriate practice placement educator training.

Condition:

The programme team need to produce an electronically based mentor update grid which shows the grade of staff qualifications, teaching qualifications and when they were last updated.

Reason:

It was difficult to see within the documentation, clear up to date information regarding placement mentor staff, such as who they are and what qualifications they hold. Through producing an electronically based update grid, this will help ensure this information is kept up to date and can also act as a monitoring aid.

Condition 4

5.7.3 Students and practice placement educators must be fully prepared for placement which will include information about and understanding of the expectations of professional conduct.

6.6 Professional aspects of practice must be integral to the assessment procedures in both the education setting and practice placement.

Condition:

More detailed references need to be included within the documentation given to students, of the HPC Standards of Proficiency and HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics.

Reason:

It was not clearly stipulated within the documentation the relevance of HPC Standards of Proficiency and HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics. This needs to be more explicit.

Condition 5

6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:

6.7.1 for student progression and achievement within the programme;

Condition:

The programme team must review and resubmit documentation, wherever it states eligibility to register, it should state 'eligibility to apply for registration with HPC'. There also needs to be consistency in the definitions of the HPC

Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics and the AODP student code of conduct.

Reason:

References made within the documentation stating 'eligibility to register' are misleading for it should state 'eligibility to apply for registration with HPC'. This needs to be changed.

Many references to AODP were clearly presented within the documentation however references to the HPC Standards of Conduct, Performance and Ethics were not clearly defined. This needs to be included and clearly articulated within the documentation.

Condition 6:

**6.7 Assessment regulations clearly specify requirements:
6.7.5 for the appointment of at least one external examiner from the relevant part of the Register.**

Condition:

In line with Set 6.7.5, evidence must be provided that demonstrates compliance with the standard governing the appointment of an external examiner.

Reason;

The visitors appreciate the skills and expertise of the current external examiner. However, it is a requirement that evidence needs to be provided demonstrating the appointment of an external examiner which meets this set.

Deadline for conditions to be met: 31st May 2007

RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendation 1

**SET 3. Programme management and resource standards
3.7 The resources to support student learning in all settings must be used effectively.**

Recommendation:

Encourage the development of a simulated operating theatre to enhance student experience.

Reason:

Through student feedback it was apparent that they would truly benefit from having an opportunity at the university to experience a simulated operating theatre prior to placement.

Recommendation 2

4.7 Where there is inter-professional learning the profession specific skills and knowledge of each professional group are adequately addressed.

Recommendation:

To review the Inter-professional / shared learning component of the programme, in light of student feedback.

Reason:

Through student feedback it was felt that the inter-professional learning component could be improved. The visitors encourage the programme team to continue to develop this component through student feedback.

Recommendation 3

5.3.2 The practice placement settings must provide safe and effective practice

Recommendation:

Allow the discretion of the CCOs to permit students to work more flexible shift patterns to mirror that of their mentors in order to enhance the student experience, e.g. nights, weekends.

Reason:

It was highlighted during the placement mentors meeting that opportunities within placement can arise where students could work with their mentors outside normal working hours, which would aid in enhancing student experience.

The visitors commend the partnership between the CCOs, the University and their initiative in using honorary contracts.

The nature and quality of instruction and facilities meets the Standards of Education and Training.

We recommend to the Education and Training Committee of the HPC that they approve this programme (subject to any conditions being met). **Visitors' signatures:**

Mr Alan Mount



Mrs Julie Weir



Date: 11/04/07